	Case 2:05-cv-01034-LRH-GWF Document 2	22 Filed 01/03/06 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		DICEDICE COLUDE
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA * * * * *	
8		
9	BECKER PRESERVATION, LLC, a Nevada) Limited Liability Company,	00.05.001.1004.1011.0015
10	Plaintiff,)	02:05-CV-1034-LRH-GWF
11	vs.	<u>ORDER</u>
12 13	JAMES A. MCCLAIN, and individual,	
13	JAMES A. MCCLAIN, and individual, () RONALD A. MCCLAIN, an individual, () PACIFIC LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, a) foreign corporation, SECURITY LIFE OF ()	
15	DENVER INSURANCE COMPANY, a) foreign corporation, DOE INDIVIDUALS I-X,)	
16	and ROE COMPANIES I-V,	
17	Defendants.	
18	Presently before this Court is an ex parte motion for leave to serve by publication (# 15 ¹)	
19	brought by Plaintiffs. Service of process is effectuated pursuant to the law of the state in which	
20	the district court sits, in this case Nevada. Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(1)(i) allows for	
21	service by publication when an affidavit demonstrates that a party cannot be served despite the	
22	due diligence of the plaintiffs, a verified complaint or affidavit shows that a cause of action exists	
23	against the party on whom service by publication is requested, and that person is a necessary or	
24	proper party to the action.	
25	The Court has reviewed the affidavit filed with the pending motion and the documents	
26	that have been filed in this matter. While there is a proper affidavit informing the Court that	
27	personal service cannot be had, there is no verified complaint or allegations in the affidavit that	
28		
	¹ References to (# XX) refer to the Court's docket.	

Case 2:05-cv-01034-LRH-GWF Document 22 Filed 01/03/06 Page 2 of 2

affirmatively demonstrate that a cause of action exists against the party Plaintiffs seek to serve by publication. In addition, the Court is not convinced at this time that Plaintiffs have demonstrated due diligence in attempting to effectuate service. The extent of Plaintiff's argument is that they went to a house and the person there told them he was not the man they wanted to serve. Such limited facts are not sufficient to demonstrate due diligence. Thus, Plaintiff's motion is denied at this time. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED. DATED this 30th day of December, 2005. Sih

> LARRY R. HICKS United States District Judge